

EL 964692051 US

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 07 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**In re Application of:**

Robert W. Luffel, et al.

Group Art Unit: 2652

Serial No.: 09/337,802

Examiner: D. Davis

Filing Date: 06/22/1999

Confirmation No.: 9485

Title: APPARATUS FOR TRANSLATING
A CARTRIDGE ACCESS DEVICE

Atty. Dkt. No.: 10980296-1

To The Honorable Assistant Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PETITION TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.181(a), Applicants respectfully request the Commissioner to withdraw the holding of abandonment of the above-identified application as set forth in Paper No. 21, dated October 28, 2003. No fee is required for this Petition.

As grounds therefore, Applicants state as follows:

1. On August 8, 2003, Applicants filed an Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (the "Board") in response to the final rejection of claims 1 and 3-24 as reiterated in the Examiner's Advisory Action, Paper No.

Atty. Docket No. HP 10980298-1

9, dated February 13, 2002. Specifically, claims 1 and 3-24 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting. Claims 1, 3-7, 12-19, and 24 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Tadokoro. Claims 8-11 and 20-23 were not specifically rejected under either Section 102 or 103, thus were allowable pending resolution of the provisional double patenting rejection.

2. The Board affirmed the decision of the Examiner to provisionally reject claims 1 and 3 - 24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Board also affirmed the decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1, 13 - 15 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). However, the Board reversed the decision of the Examiner as to the rejections of claims 3 - 7, 12 and 16 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). (See Exhibit A, Decision on Appeal, Paper No. 20, dated July 24, 2003, attached hereto). Therefore, after the Board's decision, claims 3 - 12 and 16 - 23 stood allowable pending resolution of the provisional double patenting rejections.

3. On October 28, 2003, Applicants were mailed a Notice of Abandonment stating that application no. 09/337,802 was abandoned in view of:

"The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on 24 July 2003 and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims."

(See Exhibit B, Notice of Abandonment, Paper No. 21, dated October 28, 2003, attached hereto).

Atty. Docket No. HP 10980296-1

4. The holding of abandonment of the application is erroneous as the application is not in fact abandoned. While the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired, no such review was necessary. That is, the effect of the decision of the Board was to make claims 3 – 12 and 16 – 23 allowable pending resolution of the provisional double patenting rejections. Pursuant to MPEP 804 I.B., the Examiner is required to remove the provisional double patenting rejection of the allowed claims so that the application may proceed to issue as a patent. The pertinent portion of MPEP 804.I.B. states:

"... If the "provisional" double patenting rejection in one application is the only rejection remaining in that application, the examiner should then withdraw that rejection and permit the application to issue as a patent, thereby converting the "provisional" double patenting rejection in the other application(s) into a double patenting rejection at the time the one application issues as a patent. . ."


5. After the decision of the Board, the only rejection remaining as to claims 3 – 12 and 16 – 23 was the provisional double patenting rejection. Therefore, the Examiner should have issued an action removing the provisional double patenting rejection (the other application being still pending) and inviting the Applicants to rewrite claims 3 – 12 and 16 – 23 to place them in independent form and to cancel the non-allowed claims so that a patent could issue. Without such action on the part of the Examiner, Applicants were procedurally incapable of advancing to issue allowed claims 3 – 12 and 16 – 23.

6. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Commissioner withdraw the erroneous holding of abandonment and require the Examiner: (I) to remove

Atty. Docket No. HP 10980298-1

the provisional double patenting rejection of claims 3 – 12 and 16 ~ 23 and (ii)
to instruct the Applicants to rewrite the allowed claims in independent form
and cancel the non-allowed claims so that the application may issue as a
patent.

Respectfully submitted,
DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.

By: 
Bruce E. Dahl, Reg. No. 33,670
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3405
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: (303) 291-3200
FAX: (303) 291-3201

Date: 12-10-03

EL 964692051 US

RECEIVED**EXHIBIT A**

10980296-1

JUL 29 2003

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written
for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.**HP LEGAL
IPA**

Paper No. 20

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**Ex parte ROBERT W. LUFFEL and DAVID P. JONES**MAILED**

JUL 24 2003

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCESAppeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802**ON BRIEF**Before ABRAMS, FRANKFORT, and NASE, Administrative Patent Judges,
NASE, Administrative Patent Judge.**DECISION ON APPEAL**

This is a decision on appeal from the examiner's final rejection of claims 1 and 3 to 24, which are all of the claims pending in this application.

We AFFIRM.

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 2

BACKGROUND

The appellants' invention relates to positioning systems for moving cartridge access devices along arrays of data cartridges (specification, p. 1). A copy of the claims under appeal is set forth in the appendix to the appellants' brief.

Claims 1 and 3 to 24 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 24 of copending Application No. 09/371,708.

Claims 1, 3 to 7, 12 to 19 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,166,877¹ to Tadokoro et al. (Tadokoro).

Rather than reiterate the conflicting viewpoints advanced by the examiner and the appellants regarding the above-noted rejections, we make reference to the answer (Paper No. 16, mailed October 18, 2002) for the examiner's complete reasoning in support of the rejections, and to the brief (Paper No. 15, filed August 8, 2002) and reply brief (Paper No. 17, filed December 12, 2002) for the appellants' arguments thereagainst.

¹ Issued December 26, 2000.

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 3

OPINION

In reaching our decision in this appeal, we have given careful consideration to the appellants' specification and claims, to the applied prior art reference, and to the respective positions articulated by the appellants and the examiner. As a consequence of our review, we make the determinations which follow.

The provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection

We sustain the provisional rejection of claims 1 and 3 to 24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 24 of copending Application No. 09/371,708.

On June 22, 1999 the appellants filed the application under appeal and on August 9, 1999 the appellants filed Application No. 09/371,708. In the first Office action in this application (Paper No. 4, mailed May 8, 2001), the examiner provisionally rejected claims 1 to 24, all the claims then in this application, over claims 1 to 24 of copending Application No. 09/371,708 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting. The appellants filed a response to the first Office action (Paper No. 6, filed August 9, 2001) that did not contest the merits of this rejection. Instead, the appellants stated that they would submit a terminal disclaimer upon the examiner indicating that the claims are otherwise allowable. The examiner

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 4

repeated this rejection in the final rejection (Paper No. 7, mailed October 22, 2001). In the brief (p. 18), the appellants once again do not contest the merits of this rejection but contend that the rejection is not ripe for review. Specifically, the appellants state that "since no claims have yet issued, it is not possible to make a meaningful determination as to whether a double patenting rejection would be warranted." The appellants then request that the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection be held in abeyance until claims of the copending Application No. 09/371,708 are allowed.

The appellants' argument that the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection is not ripe for review is simply wrong. This board and its reviewing courts have sanctioned and reviewed provisional double patenting rejections based upon claims in a copending application. E.g., *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 892, 225 USPQ 845, 648 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (double patenting rejection over claims of three copending applications affirmed on the merits); *In re Mott*, 539 F.2d 1291, 1296, 190 USPQ 536, 541 (CCPA 1976) (double patenting rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 over claims in a copending application was held correct on the merits but reversed because rejection was made final rather than provisional); *In re Wetterau*, 356 F.2d 556, 558, 148 USPQ 499, 501 (CCPA 1966) (affirming provisional double patenting rejection over claims in a

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 5

copending application on the merits)²; Ex parte Karol, 8 USPQ2d 1771 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1988) (the propriety of imposing a provisional rejection on the ground of double patenting of the obviousness type). Had the appellants asserted that the subject matter of claims 1 and 3 to 24 was patentably distinct from the subject matter of claims 1 to 24 of copending Application No. 09/371,708, the issue would have been reviewable by this Board. The appellants cannot strip the Board of its jurisdiction simply by failing to argue the merits. Accordingly, the decision of the examiner to provisionally reject claims 1 and 3 to 24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is affirmed.

The anticipation rejection

We sustain the rejection of claims 1, 13 to 15 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), but not the rejection of claims 3 to 7, 12 and 16 to 19.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Bros. Inc. v. Union Oil Co. 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed.

² As explained in Wetterau, the provisional nature of this type of rejection meant that if a patent did not issue on the related application, the provisional rejection would evaporate. The court noted in the obviousness-type double patenting context of that case that certain benefits inured to the applicant and the USPTO through use of such a provisional procedure, i.e., by making the applicant aware at the earliest possible time of the existence of a double patenting issue, the applicant has an opportunity to elect which application to let issue, while prosecution in the USPTO is hastened.

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 6

Cir.), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 827 (1987). The inquiry as to whether a reference anticipates a claim must focus on what subject matter is encompassed by the claim and what subject matter is described by the reference. As set forth by the court in Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 713 F.2d 760, 772, 218 USPQ 781, 789 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1026 (1984), it is only necessary for the claims to "read on' something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference, or 'fully met' by it."

Claims 1, 13 to 15 and 24

The appellants argue throughout both briefs that independent claims 1, 13 to 15 and 24 are novel over the disclosure of Tadokoro since these claims recite that a guide member is integral with a gear rack.³ The appellants point out that Tadokoro's upper and lower rack members 32 disposed on upper and lower guide rails 8 are separate, not integral, elements.⁴ The examiner in the answer responds by stating that the terms integral and one-piece are not synonymous; and that the meaning of integral is rigidly secured, fastened or welded.

³ Claims 1 and 13 recite "a first elongate guide member integral with said first elongate gear rack." Claim 15 recites "said second elongate guide member comprises an integral portion of said second elongate gear rack." Claim 24 recites "guide means integral with said elongate gear rack."

⁴ According to the appellants' argument, the term integral as used in this application means "one-piece."

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 7

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) applies to the verbiage of the claims before it the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in the appellants' specification. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997). See also In re Snead, 710 F.2d 1544, 1548, 218 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

The examiner in the anticipation rejection before us in this appeal has interpreted the claimed guide member being integral with a gear rack to read on Tadokoro's upper and lower rack members 32 disposed on upper and lower guide rails 8. By this the examiner clearly meant that he interpreted the phrase "integral with" to encompass separate elements attached together as in Tadokoro. The examiner (answer, pp. 4-5) cites numerous cases and a dictionary in which the word "integral" had been interpreted to encompass multi-piece structures.

We conclude that the examiner's interpretation is reasonable in light of all the evidence before the Board. The court has on several prior occasions interpreted the term "integral" to cover more than a unitary construction. See, e.g., In re Morris, 127 F.3d at 1055-56, 44 USPQ2d at 1029, Advanced Cardiovascular Sys. v. Scimed Life

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 8

Sys., 887 F.2d 1070, 1074, 12 USPQ2d 1539, 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1989); In re Kohno, 391 F.2d 959, 157 USPQ 275 (CCPA 1968), In re Dike, 394 F.2d 584, 157 USPQ 581 (CCPA 1968), In re Larson, 340 F.2d 965, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965), and In re Clark, 214 F.2d 148, 102 USPQ 241 (CCPA 1954). Absent an express definition in the specification, the fact that the appellants can point to definitions or usages that conform to their interpretation does not make the examiner's definition unreasonable when the examiner can point to other sources that support his interpretation. In fact, the appellants' specification implicitly discloses embodiments other than the preferred embodiment in which the elongate guide member 50 takes the form of a turned-up edge of the gear rack 20.⁵

For the reasons set forth above, the appellants argument fails to persuade that the subject matter of claims 1, 13 to 15 and 24 is novel. Accordingly, the decision of the examiner to reject claims 1, 13 to 15 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is affirmed.

⁵ Page 10, lines 16-20, of the specification states that "[t]he first or lower elongate gear rack 20 also may be provided with an elongate guide member 50 which, in one preferred embodiment, may take the form of a turned-up edge of the elongate gear rack 20, as is also best seen in Figure 2."

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 9

Claims 3 to 7 and 16 to 19

The appellants argue throughout both briefs that dependent claims 3 to 7 and 16 to 19 are novel over the disclosure of Tadokoro since these claims recite that the first elongate guide member comprises first and second opposed bearing surfaces and that the first bearing is mounted to the cartridge access device to slidably engage the first and second opposed bearing surfaces of the first elongate guide member. We agree. In that regard, we agree with the appellants that Tadokoro's guide rollers 33 which roll on first and second opposed surfaces of the guide rail 8 (see Figure 22) do not slidably engage first and second opposed surfaces of the guide rail 8. Accordingly, the decision of the examiner to reject claims 3 to 7 and 16 to 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is reversed.

Claim 12

The appellants argue throughout both briefs that dependent claim 12 is novel over the disclosure of Tadokoro since it recites that the pinion drive apparatus comprises: a motor having a shaft; a worm attached to the shaft of the motor; and a worm gear operatively connected to the first and second drive pinions, the worm gear mounted to engage the worm mounted to the shaft of the motor. We agree. In that regard, the examiner's determination (answer, p. 4) that Tadokoro in Figure 20 shows motor 34 with worm and worm gear 39 attached to the shaft of motor 39 such that gear

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 10

39 is operatively connected to pinions 41 is incorrect. Tadokoro does not teach a worm attached to the shaft of the motor 34 but instead teaches a pulley 35. Tadokoro also does not teach a worm gear mounted to engage the worm mounted to the shaft of the motor but instead teaches a belt 36 for transmitting drive from pulley 35 to shaft 38 via drive pulley 37. Additionally, we note that Tadokoro's drive train from motor 34 to pinions 41 does not utilize either a worm or a worm gear.⁸ Accordingly, the decision of the examiner to reject claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is reversed.

CONCLUSION

To summarize, the decision of the examiner to provisionally reject claims 1 and 3 to 24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is affirmed; the decision of the examiner to reject claims 1, 13 to 15 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is affirmed; and the decision of the examiner to reject claims 3 to 7, 12 and 16 to 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is reversed.

Since at least one rejection of each of the appealed claims has been affirmed, the decision of the examiner is affirmed.


⁸ Drive gear 39 is a pinion-type gear not a worm-type gear.


Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 11


No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal
may be extended under 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED


NEAL E. ABRAMS
Administrative Patent Judge


CHARLES E. FRANKFORT
Administrative Patent Judge

)
) BOARD OF PATENT
) APPEALS
) AND
) INTERFERENCES
)


JEFFREY V. NASE
Administrative Patent Judge

Appeal No. 2003-0988
Application No. 09/337,802

Page 12

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

JVN/jg

NOTICE

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Mail
Effective May 1, 2003

Appeals

All correspondence in an application involved in an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences during the period from when an appeal docketing notice is issued until a decision has been rendered by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences as well as any hearing confirmations, waivers and requests for rehearing of a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences should be mailed to:

**Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

Notices of appeal, appeal briefs, reply briefs, requests for oral hearing should be addressed to:

**Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Interferences

All mail to the Board relating to patent interferences should be sent to the following address unless an administrative patent judge or the Board specifically requires the use of a different address after May 1, 2003:

**Mail Stop INTERFERENCE
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

Any inquiries regarding the content of this notice should be directed to a Program and Resources Administrator of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at (703) 308-9797.

EL 964692051 US

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Director COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/037,302	06/23/1999	ROBERT W. LUPEL	109800296-1	9485
22879	7590	10/26/2003		
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER	
			DAVIS, DAVID DONALD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2632	
			DATE MAILED: 10/25/2003	

RECEIVED

NOV 07 2004

RIP-AEKGAD
02/04

2/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of Abandonment		Application No. 08/337,802	Applicant(s) LUFFEL ET AL.
		Examiner David D. Davis	Art Unit 2652
<p><i>- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address.</i></p> <p>This application is abandoned in view of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on _____. (a) <input type="checkbox"/> A reply was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____. (b) <input type="checkbox"/> A proposed reply was received on _____, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection. (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114). (c) <input type="checkbox"/> A reply was received on _____ but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below). (d) <input type="checkbox"/> No reply has been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTO-85). (a) <input type="checkbox"/> The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTO-85). (b) <input type="checkbox"/> The submitted fee of \$_____ is insufficient. A balance of \$_____ is due. The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$_____. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$_____. (c) <input type="checkbox"/> The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37). (a) <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed corrected drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply. (b) <input type="checkbox"/> No corrected drawings have been received. 4. <input type="checkbox"/> The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants. 5. <input type="checkbox"/> The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. 6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on <u>24 July 2003</u> and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims. 7. <input type="checkbox"/> The reason(s) below: 			

[Signature]
David D. Davis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2652

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTO-1432 (Rev. 04-01)